**Sample PF Debate Ballot - 10/24/18**

**Judge Name:** Shiv Khandelwal

**Pro Speaker #1 Name:** Pragya Malik - Princeton MO Speaker 1 **Speaker Points:** 29.5

**Pro Speaker #2 Name:** Sinan Ozbay - Princeton MO Speaker 2 **Speaker Points:** 28

**Con Speaker #1 Name:** ?? - Plano West HF Speaker 1 **Speaker Points:** 28.5

**Con Speaker #2 Name:** ?? - Plano West HF Speaker 2 **Speaker Points:** 28.5

**School You are Voting For**: Princeton MO

Please Verify the Side You Voted For – Underline One – **Pro** or Con

**Comments for the Pro Speakers**

* The first speaker was articulate and clear, not speaking too fast.
* She also effectively weighed arguments, and collapsed them in the summary,
* This made the flow of the debate easy to comprehend for a lay judge
* The second speaker was also articulate, and clear, however he spoke with increasing speed and aggression throughout the round (resulted in lower speaking points), which unnecessarily made the environment more tense.
* Despite this, his intensity augmented the persuasiveness of his arguments, and made it seem to me that he was passionate and cared about the resolution.
* He also weighed and extended effective arguments, and then collapsed them in the final focus to bring the focus of the debate to the pro’s overwhelming offense.

**Comments for the Con Speakers**

* The first speaker was articulate and clear throughout the round, however I think she was kind of quiet, and unimposing.
* She made effective speeches, with a good balance of offensive and defensive arguments.
* She didn’t effectively weigh impacts, which continued throughout the round.

* The second speaker was again articulate and clear (kind of a common theme), however he was also pretty quiet.
* He did a lot of analysis (as opposed to raw argumentation) in the debate, which helped the judge.
* He didn’t do much weighing between pro and con impacts, which is bad.

**Reasons for Your Decision:**

* The most important fact throughout the round was that the Pro effectively weighed their arguments, but also, the Pro just had better offensive arguments to which the Con had pretty weak answers to; the most prominent of which was the argument about industrialization leading to a decrease in poverty, which was basically uncontested. Also contributing to the fact that the Con’s arguments couldn’t be weighed was their evidence, which didn’t give a lot of numerical empirics, and were very vague. In the final focus, the Pro did a really good job of summarizing their overwhelming offense and weighing it against a nebulous Con defense with very little numerical evidence, so it was a pretty clear decision to vote Pro.